individuals are not pure. But the purity ot individuals
and their continued growth in righteousness imply their
inclusion in a society of which the members owe duties to
one another, and in which a free exchange of thoughts and
sentiments and an active co-operation in good work are
possible. These things are inconceivable in a state of
existence in which souls are disembodied; for it is through
our bodies that we are able to communicate with one another.
The very conditions of that spiritual life, then, which make
immortality necessary and desirable, require that souls should
be reborn either in this very world or in others more or less
similar to this.
It is further urged that the necessity for reincarnation
lies in the fact, that, though the acquired spiritual possessions
of the individual remain intact after death in the Universal
Self, they remain there unmanifested, not as the objects of
the finite self's distinct consciousness. Their manifestation
requires a body with senses and organs. This, they declare,
is proved by the difference between sleep and waking. The
self's activity in the waking state is in abeyance in sound
sleep when the organs of knowledge are inactive. The

individual self is not indeed destroyed in the absence of a fresh body. It is naturally indestructible, but until it gets a fresh body, it will remain unmanifested as in dreamless sleep. It will not experience the results of its *Karma;* its spiritual progress will remain in abeyance. Its desires will inevitably lead it towards re-incarnation,—will make a fresh body for it. In other words, the disembodied *Ego,* through the undying desire in him unconsciously furnishes the conditions of his successive self-procreations in various forms which depend on his mental state and *kama,* the good or bad deeds of his preceding existence, commonly called €< merit and demerit."

But those who object to the theory of re-incarnation say—

€t If the self is born again, if a grown up self becomes